

characters: (1) the eyes in *Protazteca* are smaller and situated more posteriorly than in *Azteca*; (2) the scale of the petiole is more strongly inclined in *Azteca*; and (3) the forewings of *Protazteca* have two cubital cells, but those of *Azteca* have only one. This last distinction may be considered as indicative of the more primitive nature of the Miocene forms.

In 1906 Cockerell described a female ant from Florissant as *Ponera hendersoni*, which he placed in *Ponera* because of its similarity to the figure of *Ponera coarctata* Latr. in one of Wheeler's papers. His description of this ant is based almost entirely upon details of wing venation, so that it is impossible to recognize the species from the characters mentioned, and unfortunately the single specimen which Cockerell studied was lost shortly after the description was prepared. Wheeler subsequently pointed out (1910) that this ant could not be a true *Ponera* because of its large size. In 1927 Cockerell found three additional specimens (Sternberg collection, at the British Museum) which he believes to be this species, from a comparison with the same figure of *Ponera coarctata*. He placed the ant this time in *Euponera*, but did not designate any of these additional specimens as neotypes. Professor Cockerell kindly retained one of these newly acquired fossils so that I was able to examine it on my visit to Boulder in 1927. The specimen he showed me turned out to be a poorly preserved individual of the species which I am describing below as *Protazteca elongata*. At first I believed that the best procedure to clear up the difficulty would be to designate one of these new specimens of Cockerell's as the neotype of *Protazteca hendersoni* (= *Euponera hendersoni*). At that time my study of the Florissant ants was not completed, and after further examination of the material at hand I found two other species of *Protazteca*, both of which had as much and even more the appearance of *Ponera coarctata* (with which Cockerell made his original comparison) as *Protazteca elongata*. This accordingly brought up the question of the accuracy of Cockerell's determination of the specimens in the Sternberg collection, since twenty years had passed from the time of his description and the loss of the type, and especially since his description would apply to any one of three species of ants in the Florissant beds. In consideration of all the complications of the situation, it seems best to describe all three species of *Protazteca* as new, and to disregard the name *Euponera hendersoni*, until the type is found.